

Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of January 8, 2014

Members Present: Capi Wampler, Nan Chase, David Carpenter, Patricia Cothran, Woodard Farmer, David Nutter, Tracey Rizzo, Jo Stephenson

Members Absent: Brian Cook, J. Ray Elingburg, Richard Fast, Brendan Ross

Staff: Stacy Merten, Peggy Gardner, Jannice Ashley

Public: Michael McDonough, Mark Marshall, Kevin Ward, Geoff Mohnby

Call to Order: Chair Wampler calls the meeting to order at 4:00 pm with a quorum present.

Adoption of Minutes: Commissioner Carpenter moves to adopt the December 11, 2013 minutes as written.
Second by: Commissioner Nutter
Vote for: ALL

Consent Agenda:

(Commissioner Cothran asks that 152 Montford Avenue be removed from the Consent Agenda.)

1.
Owner/Applicant: Joseph Kitt
Subject Property: 139 Montford Ave.
Hearing Date: January 8, 2014
Historic District: Montford
PIN: 9649.12-2492-00000
Zoning District: RM-16

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – revised rendering of front elevation; Exhibit B – revised 1st and 2nd story floor plans; Exhibit C – revised front (west), southwest and south elevation drawings; Exhibit D – door and sidelight specifications (*submitted 1/8/14*); Exhibit E – photograph of similar doors at 155 Montford Avenue; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of December, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 26th day of December, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits F and G.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.

3. That the application is to **Amend CA #13-00003067 to read as follows** : Construct new 2,227 sq. ft. single family home with basement and wrap around front porch per attached approved plans and specifications. New structure will have smooth stucco foundation. Siding will be wood German lapped on 1st floor with shingles above. Roof will be hipped style with exposed rafter tails, and 24” overhang. Roof covering will be dark gray composition asphalt shingles. Other details include turret, corner boards and 4.5” window and door surrounds. Chimney will be brick. Windows will be aluminum clad, one over one. Porch will have wood balustrade with 2” x 2” rails, 4” on center and fluted support columns salvaged from original home on site. Front door will be salvaged from original home. **Install new wood French door with transom and sidelights per attached revised drawings dated 12/18/13.** Brick sidewalk and landscaping per attached approved landscape plans. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That the guidelines for New Construction found on pages 92-93 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The new door is is compatible with the structure and other historic buildings in the district.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Rizzo

Vote for: ALL

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Rizzo

Vote for: ALL

Public Hearings:

Agenda Item

Owner/Applicant:	Michael McDonough
Subject Property:	152 Montford Ave.
Hearing Date:	January 8, 2014
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649.12-0436-00000
Zoning District:	RM-8

<p>Staff Comments</p>	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p>Property Description from National Register nomination: (Pentecostal Tabernacle) Late 19th early 20th century temple form structure, formerly a grocery, with false front. Altered. Before 1907 (S)</p> <p>Certificate of Appropriateness Request: Amend CA#13-00003067 as follows: Rehabilitate property for residential and commercial use per attached revised plans dated 11/23/13 and specifications. Work will include the following items. 1) Remove metal flue and brick chimney. 2) South elevation: remove metal door, stair and landings. Cut opening and install new (insert specs) door. 3) West/rear elevation: cut and install new aluminum clad, full light entrance door. Install new pair of full light aluminum clad doors on 2nd level. Construct 6' x 10' entry porch with balcony above suspended by 3" metal plate bracketed posts; porch and balcony will have metal posts with horizontal cable railings; enclose porch sides with vertical wood fencing. 4) North/side elevation: remove basement level door and infill retaining walls. 5) Front elevation: remove metal siding and install wood lapped siding to match rest of building. Increase overhang on parapet roof 2"; add trim below and metal cap on top. Install new trim around windows. Install zinc alloy metal roof on metal purlins supported by curved metal brackets. Install new full light glass door with narrow metal style rails. Install new thin metal handrails. 6) North side elevation: Remove non-historic door and replace with wood and glass door. Replace non historic windows with (insert specs) 7) Restore all original wood windows, trim, siding and masonry as necessary.8) Site work includes excavating earth to reveal full basement level and construct a brick patio on the north side. Create 2 parking spaces on W. Chestnut St. and relocate the sidewalk; construct stone wall not to exceed 18" in height adjacent to north side patio and stone wall on south side 24" high with metal gate. Replace sloped concrete slab in front of building with brick steps and sidewalk. Remove asphalt and install new street trees, buffer plantings and foundation plantings. Construct 72" high wooden fence to conceal mechanical equipment on south side of structure. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</p> <p>Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines & Submittal Requirements:</p> <p>The Secretary of Interior Standards found on page 29, and the guidelines for Wood found on pages 66-67, in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p>Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The structure will be rehabilitated for a new use that is compatible with its historic character.
	<p>Commissioner Cothran states when the Commission voted on this project in August, 2013, they did not have information that is now available. She says when the decision was made, they were guessing about the siding that was underneath the aluminum siding on the front façade. She says first the</p>

	<p>applicant proposed vertical siding, then shingles, and now lap siding that matches the rest of the building.</p> <p>She says the building was built around 1900 and was originally a store. She presents a photograph of the building that shows people standing under a bracketed cornice which appears to extend across the front façade above the windows on the first floor.</p> <p>She notes the peak on the front façade was added, and says there is evidence of this with the hollow areas that have been found behind the current siding. She says she talked with Charles Hadden, the son of one of the original trustees of the church, who says the peak was not there when the church purchased the building in 1962. He says it was added to make the building look like a church.</p> <p>Commissioner Cothran says Mr. McDonough has done a great job of trying to research the original condition of the building, including the material of the front façade. She notes he is taking great pains to keep the original windows. She understands the reason he doesn't want to remove the false peak on the front façade is a financial one, but she would like the Commission to discuss whether he should do that, to restore the building to its original roofline.</p> <p>Ms. Merten says the application before the Commission is to amend his original application, in this case he is only asking to change the siding material. She does not think the Commission could require the applicant to restore the original roof line. Commissioner Cothran says she is not asking for the Commission to require that. She says plans for the front façade are still in question, and have not been finally approved. Ms. Merten disagrees, says they were approved (<i>September 2013</i>). She says asking the applicant to consider restoring the roofline profile would be worthwhile. Commissioner Cothran says additional information was uncovered when the applicant removed the aluminum siding, and this information was not available when the Commission voted originally.</p> <p>Commissioner Farmer asks if Commissioner Cothran knows what the roof looked like before. She answers no, but that Mr. Hadden has indicated it was a flat-topped corbie step gable. Ms. Merten draws a sketch of this style, Commissioner Cothran agrees this is what she thinks it was. She says Mr. McDonough has also indicated the peak was not original, having uncovered hollow areas behind it.</p> <p>Commissioner Cothran states if the aluminum siding had been removed before the Commission's first discussion in August, their decision might have been different.</p>
Applicant(s)	<p>Michael McDonough, architect, says they are still uncovering things as they progress with the project. He says they have submitted this design as part of the tax credit process, and need to keep those wheels moving. He asks about the period of significance in Montford. Ms. Merten says 1890 – 1930, and notes that changes after that period could have gained</p>

	<p>significance.</p> <p>Mr. McDonough asks when the peak might have been added. Commissioner Cothran says the church bought the building in 1962 with a ten year deed of trust, and acquired a second deed in 1972. She thinks it was probably built when they paid off first deed, but could have been before.</p> <p>Mr. McDonough notes the building has evolved through the years, and says it is problematic to be expected to peel off a hundred years of changes. He notes they did not want to disturb the asbestos siding, even though it would be interesting to find out more about what is underneath.</p> <p>Ms. Merten asks him to clarify, if they have made their current request based on what they have uncovered. Mr. McDonough says it is their best guess on what may have been there. They do not intend to do further archeological investigations, nor go to the expense to build a cornice as shown in the photograph Commissioner Cothran presented. He says if rot is uncovered and necessitates changes in their plans, they would certainly consider these findings.</p> <p>Commissioner Farmer asks Mr. McDonough if building a cornice with dentil moulding like the one found would be expensive. Commissioner Carpenter says he has just worked on a similar project, it had to be custom built and was very expensive. Commissioner Farmer notes the building is one of the most signal buildings on the street. He wonders if the Commission could ask the applicant to rebuild the cornice, and the stepped roof.</p> <p>Commissioner Rizzo asks Atty. Ashley to clarify what the Commission could do. Atty. Ashley says she does not see anything in the guidelines that says when you start to undertake renovations that you will have to bring something back to its original character. She only sees where if someone is replacing something, such as wood, it should be replaced with the same material. She says if the applicant was taking off the roof, then the guidelines would indicate the original roofline should be restored. Ms. Merten adds if an applicant was proposing to do this, then they would be asked to provide evidence of the original form.</p> <p>Atty. Ashley notes this application has already been approved. Ms. Merten says it was approved with a condition about the siding, if more information was found the applicant was asked to provide that information. She notes this is what he has done, and he had not asked to change the roofline. Commissioner Chase adds there is nothing to prevent the applicant, or anyone, to apply to change the roofline in the future. Chair Wampler agrees, and reiterates this point.</p> <p>Commissioner Nutter asks what the expense would be to restore the roofline. Chair Wampler and Ms. Merten point out this is not part of the discussion. Commissioner Farmer wonders how much effort and money would be involved for the applicant to remove more siding to find out more about the roofline, since more work will be done in that area</p>
--	--

	<p>anyway. Ms. Merten says the Commission could not make the applicant restore the roofline, even if he did this. Commissioner Cothran says no one has said anything about requiring, or making. Ms. Merten says she is confused, is she asking for more investigation for the record?</p> <p>Commissioner Cothran says she would like to ask the applicant to peel back or remove the silver metal on the back side of the peaked roof to see if he can determine if the stepped roof was there. Ms. Merten says this is reasonable to ask.</p> <p>Mr. McDonough offers to consider changes if evidence is uncovered that the stepped profile is intact. Commissioner Cothran wonders why if someone is so close to being able to determine this, why they wouldn't want to go further. Mr. McDonough says he does not want to disturb the asbestos, and has already bought the siding and plans to install it over the entire existing façade so there is no more asbestos disturbance.</p> <p>Commissioner Cothran asks how difficult it would be to remove the metal from the back of the peak. He replies a large section would have to be peeled back, and this would expose the building to moisture.</p> <p>Mr. McDonough thinks the cornice design shown in the photograph may have caused rot problems, perhaps that was why it was removed. He notes his project will not prevent anyone from putting on a similar cornice, or changing the roofline in the future. Commissioner Cothran asks if he could really foresee someone doing that in the future. Mr. McDonough wonders if anyone could have foreseen this discussion. Ms. Merten notes it is a good opportunity since work is being done.</p> <p>Mr. McDonough asks how often the Commission asks applicants to determine what was originally there, and restore it to that state. Ms. Merten says this only happens if it is part of their proposal. She says sometimes applicants are asked to consider restorations, sometimes they are willing, sometimes not.</p> <p>Mr. McDonough reiterates his need to move forward with the project, he has a tenant waiting to open a business. He says he can't rebuild the building just the way it was in 1905, he just needs to renovate it and bring it back to life. He restates he will certainly consider the original roofline if situations arise that would make it feasible, but he definitely does not want to rebuild the cornice.</p>
--	---

Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Stephenson says she feels compelled to add to the other Commissioners' opinions that this is a unique opportunity to restore a prominent and unique building to its original design, and that although it is not required, she hopes the applicant will consider it.

Commission Action

MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – revised rendering of front façade with new and restored features indicated; Exhibit B – three photographs of existing conditions; Exhibit C – three photographs showing façade at earlier date (*submitted 1/8/14*); and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of December, 2013, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property was notified of this hearing in the mail on the 26th day of December, 2013 as indicated by Exhibits D and E.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to **Amend CA#13-00003067 as follows:** Rehabilitate property for residential and commercial use **per attached revised plans dated 11/23/13** and specifications. Work will include the following items. 1) Remove metal flue and brick chimney. 2) South elevation: remove metal door, stair and landings. Cut opening and install new (insert specs) door. 3) West/rear elevation: cut and install new aluminum clad, full light entrance door. Install new pair of full light aluminum clad doors on 2nd level. Construct 6’ x 10’ entry porch with balcony above suspended by 3” metal plate bracketed posts; porch and balcony will have metal posts with horizontal cable railings; enclose porch sides with vertical wood fencing. 4) North/side elevation: remove basement level door and infill retaining walls. 5) Front elevation: remove metal siding and install **wood lapped siding to match rest of building**. Increase overhang on parapet roof 2”; add trim below and metal cap on top. Install new trim around windows. Install zinc alloy metal roof on metal purlins supported by curved metal brackets. Install new full light glass door with narrow metal style rails. Install new thin metal handrails. 6) North side elevation: Remove non-historic door and replace with wood and glass door. Replace non historic windows with (insert specs) 7) Restore all original wood windows, trim, siding and masonry as necessary. 8) Site work includes excavating earth to reveal full basement level and construct a brick patio on the north side. Create 2 parking spaces on W. Chestnut St. and relocate the sidewalk; construct stone wall not to exceed 18” in height adjacent to north side patio and stone wall on south side 24” high with metal gate. Replace sloped concrete slab in front of building with brick steps and sidewalk. Remove asphalt and install new street trees, buffer plantings and foundation plantings. Construct 72” high wooden fence to conceal mechanical equipment on south side of structure. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. That The Secretary of Interior Standards found on page 29, and the guidelines for Wood found on pages 66-67, in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, and amended August, 2013, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
 - a. The structure will be rehabilitated for a new use that is compatible with its historic character.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Farmer

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: Commissioners Wampler, Chase, Carpenter, Farmer, Nutter, Rizzo, and Stephenson

Vote against: Commissioner Cothran

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issue d**.

Motion by: Commissioner Farmer

Second by: Commissioner Rizzo

Vote for: Commissioners Wampler, Chase, Carpenter, Farmer, Nutter, Rizzo, and Stephenson

Vote against: Commissioner Cothran

Preliminary Review:

1. *(continued)*

Owner/Applicant:	Mark Marshall
Subject Property	42 Cumberland Avenue
Hearing Date:	January 8, 2014
Historic District:	Montford
PIN:	9649-21-0881
Zoning District:	RM-8

Staff Comments	Ms. Merten explains this application was reviewed in December, and the applicants had been asked to make a few changes. She understands they would like to talk more about these changes and explain why they want to keep the plans as they were.
Applicant(s)	Mark Marshall, Trio Construction, says the architect, Michael McDonough will also explain things. Mr. Marshall points out areas that have been changed – the external staircase has been covered, window placement and styles are slightly different, and the driveway extends further along the side of the house. He explains the site’s topography prevents them from extending it further.

Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Farmer asks why they have elected to retain lap siding on the front under the porch. Mr. Marshall says this is a detail that exists around Montford. Commissioner Farmer

encourages him to bring photographs of these to the final review.

Michael McDonough, architect, explains that shake siding is a rustic material for the porch. He wants to create an outdoor space that feels like a room, and by switching to a smooth siding it enhances this. He says he has done this on previous projects and it works well.

Commissioner Farmer says stucco or pebbledash is more common for the lower level in Montford. Ms. Merten says there are many houses with smooth siding on the lower level. Mr. McDonough thinks the proposed lapped siding will blend with the shake siding after it is stained and not be very noticeable, and thinks pebbledash would be more of a contrast. Commissioner Farmer says consistency with neighborhood style is more of a concern, and he would like to see examples of other houses with this treatment.

Commissioner Nutter asks if the applicant thinks a room feeling within a porch is part of the historic tradition in Montford. Mr. McDonough replies this is esoteric, but thinks sleeping porches may have smoother siding.

Ms. Merten asks Mr. McDonough to bring photographs of other district houses with similar style to his final review. She asks about window details on the back elevation she thinks are too varied, Commissioner Chase finds them acceptable. Mr. McDonough says his window proposal is relatively tame compared to some examples in Montford, and notes he has provided examples of these variations.

Mr. Marshall says the owner wants to keep the footprint as is, to provide an area for a future accessory building and to preserve a large oak tree.

Commissioner Farmer asks about the siding on the south elevation under the staircases. Mr. Marshall says this area underneath the stairs has been covered on three sides, Mr. McDonough says they might use louvers or some other kind of screening. Ms. Merten says whatever they determine, it needs to be clear on the final drawings.

Other Business:

Preservation Plan update. Ms. Merten says an advisory committee meeting was held on January 7, and they are working to set up focus groups. She says a Public Meeting will be held on January 30, 2014. She believes this will be at the Grove Park Inn.

Commissioners' Retreat. The retreat will be held on February 19, 2014 at Stratford Towers. Ms. Merten says if the Commissioners have ideas for topics, to please let her know. She says Annie McDonald from the SHPO will be there to talk about Landmark procedures.

Chair Wampler asks if any district representatives will be invited to tell more about the districts. Ms. Merten says she could do this. Commissioner Chase says the City of Asheville has adopted a plant list in accordance with Bee City status, and asks if this should be used as an overlay for HRC's recommended species list. Ms. Merten says she may ask Judy Daniel to come and talk about interfacing with City policies.

Commissioner Carpenter asks if guideline modifications will be addressed. Ms. Merten says she does plan to discuss the Albemarle Park guideline process, which has been ongoing. She hopes these can be finalized in 2014, and notes the book about Albemarle Park will be out in May.

Atty. Ashley says will be glad to answer any procedural questions. Commissioner Nutter notes

the Preservation Plan may address the formation of new districts of some kind, and he would welcome a discussion about the current political atmosphere in NC and how it would affect this. Ms. Merten and Atty. Ashley agree such a discussion and a review of existing laws would be helpful.

Commissioner Farmer says another topic might be related to the situation the Commission just addressed, about restoring an original feature. Atty. Ashley notes some historic districts require buildings to be maintained, and says a discussion of Commissions' powers and what kind of conditions they may impose would be interesting.

Commissioner Chase moves to adjourn the meeting.

Second by: Commissioner Stephenson

Vote for: ALL

The meeting is adjourned at 5:20 pm.